GRASSLAND RESERVE PROGRAM - TENNESSEE RANKING CRITERIA - <u>EASEMENT OPTIONS</u> -FY 2004 PERMANENT, 30-YEAR EASEMENT

- OFFERED LAND MUST BE IN A 40-ACRE OR LARGER CONTIGUOUS BLOCK OF GRASS.
- CIRCLE ONLY ONE SCORE WITHIN EACH OF ITEM NUMBERS I-X (BOLD).
- PREDOMINANCE (MAJORITY) IS DEFINED AS MORE THAN 50%.
- DISTANCE MEASURES BASED ON AERIAL PHOTO AND NEAREST POINT IN OFFER.
- LAND WITHIN CORPORATE CITY LIMITS IS <u>NOT</u> ELIGIBLE FOR EASEMENTS.

LANDOWNER		OWNER	COUNTY	TRACT NO	DATE					
<u>ITEM</u>						SCORE				
I.	LENGTH OF EASEMENT									
	B.	PERMANENT. 30-YEAR EASEM 30-YEAR EASEM	IENT; NON-USDA EASEM IENT.	MENT EXTENSION PRO	VIDED.	5 3 1				
II.	POTENTIAL RISK FOR OFFER TO BE DEVELOPED IN NEAR FUTURE									
	A.	MAJORITY OF O	FFER HAS NO DEVELOP ED ON DISTANCE TO ON	MENT LIMITATIONS LEOR MORE OF THE FO	<u>ISTED IN ITEM C;</u> AN DLLOWING:	D				
		SUBDIVIDEDEXISTING FOR	N OR CLUSTER DEVELO O FARM WITH AT LEAST OUR LANE HIGHWAY (E: OR UNINCORPORATED T R LINES.	T 10 PARCELS FOR SAL XCLUDING THE INTER	E.					
		 WITHIN FROM 0. FROM 2 	5 TO 2 MILES			35 25 15				
	B.	RISK BASED ON CUMBERLAND, LOUDON, MACC RUTHERFORD, S	FFER HAS NO DEVELOP POPULATION GROWTH DAVIDSON, HAMILTON, ON, MAURY, MEIGS, MON SEQUATCHIE, SEVIER, SI WILLIAMSON, WILSON.	. OFFER WITHIN BLED , HICKMAN, JEFFERSO NROE, MONTGOMERY, HELBY, SMITH, STEWA	OSOE, CHEATHAM, N, JOHNSON, KNOX, , ROBERTSON,	5				
	C.		AS: OFFERS WHERE THE G DEVELOPMENT LIMIT			0				
		IN 100-YEARE-SLOPES OF	CLASS IIIW OR WETTE FLOODPLAIN OR PRED R STEEPER IN MIDDLE/V ITABLE FOR SEPTIC SYS	OMINANTLY FREQUE VEST TN; D-SLOPES OF						
III.	РО	TENTIAL FOR O	FFER TO BE CONVERT	ED TO CROPLAND						
	B.	PREDOMINANC	E OF OFFERED ACRES IN E OF OFFERED ACRES IN E OF OFFERED ACRES IN	N LAND CAPABILITY C	LASS III.	15 10 0				

ITE	ITEM (CONT.)				
IV.	. PLANT DIVERSITY				
	A.	OFFER CONSISTS OF NATIVE GRASS/FORB/SHRUB SPECIES, OR WILL BE CONVERTED TO NATIVE GRASSES (NO MORE THAN 10% INTRODUCED GRASSES).	3		
	B.	PREDOMINANTLY 3 OR MORE INTRODUCED GRASS SPECIES.	1		
	C.	PREDOMINANTLY 1-2 INTRODUCED GRASS SPECIES.	0		
V.	HABITAT DIVERSITY (SMALLER SIZE = HIGHER INTERSPERSION POTENTIAL)				
		AVERAGE CONTIGUOUS AREA IN OFFER 40-60 ACRES.	2		
		AVERAGE CONTIGUOUS AREA IN OFFER 61-80 ACRES.	1		
	C.	AVERAGE CONTIGUOUS AREA IN OFFER >80 ACRES.	0		
VI.	LO	CATION SIGNIFICANCE (GRASSLAND PRIORITY AREAS)			
	A.	OFFER IS OR WILL BE RESTORED TO NATIVE GRASSES AND IS LOCATED IN:	10		
		BARRENS AREA (COFFEE, WARREN, CANNON, DEKALB, MONTGOMERY,			
		ROBERTSON, SUMNER).			
		• CENTRAL BASIN GLADES AND BARRENS (RUTHERFORD, WILSON, DAVIDSON, BEDFORD, MARSHALL, MAURY, GILES, LEWIS).			
		 WESTERN BARRENS (DECATUR, MCNAIRY, HARDEMAN, HENRY, PERRY, WAYN 	IE).		
		RIDGE AND VALLEY BARRENS (ROANE, ANDERSON).			
	B.	OFFER IS ANY GRASSLAND AREA ADJACENT TO PROTECTED PUBLIC LANDS	5		
	0	(WRP EASEMENTS, WMA'S, NWR'S, STATE FORESTS, STATE PARKS, ETC.).	0		
	C.	ALL OTHER AREAS.	0		
VII	. GI	RAZING MANAGEMENT			
	A.	OFFER IS UNDER PROPER DOMESTIC LIVESTOCK GRAZING SYSTEM	5		
	R	(GRAZE HEIGHT ABOVE 3 INCHES, OR <75% OF CARRYING CAPACITY). OFFER PREDOMINANTLY NATIVE GRASSES AND MANAGED FOR WILDLIFE.	5		
		OFFER CURRENTLY STOCKED AT 75%-100% OF CARRYING CAPACITY.	2		
		OFFER OVERGRAZED, UNGRAZED (IDLE), OVERSTOCKED, OR ONLY HAYED.	0		
VII	I. (OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE POTENTIAL			
	A.	LOW OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS EXPECTED.	2		
		Existing ponds; alternative water sources instead of live streams (if grazed), AND			
		No significant sedimentation, contaminants expected to influence site, AND			
		Site is outside of a floodplain (lower potential-woody invasion).			
	B.		1		
	C.	NATIVE GRASSES.	0		
	C.	HIGH OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS EXPECTED.	U		
		Livestock drinking water source includes live streams, OR Subject to contamination, OR			
		Site is within a floodplain (higher potential-woody invasion).			

ITEM (CONT.)					
X. RESTORATION REQUIREMENTS					
A. OFFER PREDOMINANTLY NATIVE GRASSES/FORBS REQUIRING. NO RESTORATION, OR WILL BE RESTORED TO NATIVE GRASSES/FORBS.	3				
B. OFFER PREDOMINANTLY INTRODUCED GRASSES.	1				
C. OFFER PREDOMINANTLY CONSISTS OF WOODY PLANT ENCROACHMENT,	0				
NOXIOUS WEEDS, GULLIES, OR BARE GROUND.					
X. COST BENEFIT TO USDA					
A. ESTIMATED EASEMENT OFFER LESS THAN \$2,000 PER ACRE.	20				
B. ESTIMATED EASEMENT OFFER FROM \$2,000 TO \$3,999 PER ACRE.	15				
C. ESTIMATED EASEMENT OFFER FROM \$4,000 TO \$5,999 PER ACRE.	10				
D. ESTIMATED EASEMENT OFFER \$6,000 OR MORE PER ACRE.	0				
TOTAL SCORE					

EXAMPLE OF CALCULATIONS TO DETERMINE THE ESTIMATED EASEMENT OFFER

PERMANENT EASEMENT

Appraisal #1; full market value - \$8,000 per acre Appraisal #2; grassland value - \$1,500 per acre

Estimated offer - \$6,500 per acre (\$8,000 - \$1,500) LANDOWNER WOULD GET 0 POINTS

30-YEAR EASEMENT

Appraisal #1; full market value - \$8,000 per acre Appraisal #2; grassland value - \$1,500 per acre

Estimated offer - \$1,950 per acre (30% of the difference between the appraisals; 0.3 x (\$8,000 - \$1,500)

LANDOWNER WOULD GET 20 POINTS